

Testimony for Public Hearing
Judiciary Committee
March 6, 2023

Kurt Weisheit
Terryville, CT

OPPOSE: Raised H.B. No. 6816 - AN ACT CONCERNING MICROSTAMPING-ENABLED PISTOLS, RAISING THE AGE TO PURCHASE AMMUNITION AND RESTRICTING THE SALE AND POSSESSION OF BODY ARMOR.

Honorable Members of the Judiciary Committee,

I would like to express my sincere **opposition** to HB6816.

Requiring pistols to be “microstamping-enabled” could eventually lead to a defacto ban on most, if not ALL semi-automatic pistols, which I believe is the true intent of this bill.

The Congressional Sportsmen’s Foundation has outlined several important points of interest to be considered:¹

- Recently in Washington DC, **§ 7–2505.03** (Firearms Control Regulations Act of 1975) was amended to extend to a specified date for the implementation of the microstamping requirement for semi-automatic pistols from January 1, 2016 to January 1, 2018. An independent peer-reviewed study published in the Journal of the Association of Firearms and Toolmarks Examiners (AFTE) concluded that ***“implementing this technology will be much more complicated than burning a serial number on a few parts and dropping them into firearms being manufactured.”***
- Law enforcement groups that are in opposition to the concept pending further study include: The National Fraternal Order of Police, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), and the New York State Police, among others.
- Criminals could easily contaminate a crime scene by taking microstamped casings from a shooting range and scattering them at the scene of a crime, thus implicating innocent gun owners in crimes they did not commit.
- Additionally, criminals would be able to simply remove the microstamped parts and replace them with spare parts or use a revolver from which the cartridges are not ejected.
- If microstamping were to be mandated, it is estimated that the number of firearms available for purchase would be dramatically reduced as not all manufacturers would have the capacity to retool their manufacturing processes to accommodate the new mandate, and that the price of firearms for all consumers, including law enforcement agencies, would dramatically increase by an additional \$200.00 per firearm.

Regarding the proposal to raise the age to buy ammunition and magazines to 21 - This is not reasonable, by any means. In CT, a person must already possess one of the qualifying permits in order to purchase such items, which requires a background check before issuance.

1 <https://congressionalsportsmen.org/policies/state/microstamping>

Regarding the proposal to restrict the sale and possession of body armor:

- It is already illegal for convicted criminals to possess or purchase body armor.
- Body armor is not an “offensive” device in any way; it is purely defensive by design and one of the most passive forms of self-defense!
- This will create a false sense of security and will affect the freedom of many to own a valuable life-saving tool.

This bill will not stop crime nor enhance public safety. Instead, it will further restrict peaceable citizens’ right to self-defense, and restrict the rights of hunters and other sportsmen engaging in lawful sporting activities.

I urge members to vote AGAINST this bill.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Kurt Weisheit